



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Imaging the deep structures of Los Humeros geothermal field, Mexico, using three-component seismic noise beamform

Citation for published version:

Löer, K, Toledo, T, Norini, G, Zhang, X, Curtis, A & Saenger, EH 2020, 'Imaging the deep structures of Los Humeros geothermal field, Mexico, using three-component seismic noise beamform', *Seismological Research Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.1785/0220200022>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1785/0220200022](https://doi.org/10.1785/0220200022)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Seismological Research Letters

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Imaging the deep structures of Los Humeros geothermal field, Mexico,
using three-component seismic noise beamforming**

**Katrin Löer, Tania Toledo, Gianluca Norini, Xin Zhang, Andrew Curtis, and Erik H.
Saenger**

Corresponding author:

Katrin Löer

Bochum University of Applied Sciences

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Lennershofstr. 140

44801 Bochum

Germany

katrin.loeer@hs-bochum.de

As of 1 July 2020:

Department of Geology and Geophysics

University of Aberdeen

Meston Building

King's College

Aberdeen AB24 3UE

UK

Abstract

We present a 1D shear-velocity model for Los Humeros geothermal field (Mexico) obtained from three-component beamforming of ambient seismic noise, imaging for the first time the bottom of the sedimentary basement ~5 km below the volcanic caldera, as well as the brittle/ductile transition at ~10 km depth. Rayleigh wave dispersion curves are extracted from ambient seismic noise measurements and inverted using a Markov chain Monte Carlo scheme. The resulting probability density function provides the shear velocity distribution down to 15 km depth, hence, much deeper than other techniques applied in the area. In the upper 4 km, our model conforms to a profile from local seismicity analysis, and matches geological structure inferred from well logs which validates the methodology. Complementing information from well logs and outcrops at the near surface, discontinuities in the seismic profile can be linked to geological transitions allowing us to infer structural information of the deeper subsurface. By constraining the extent of rocks with brittle behavior and permeability conditions at greater depths, our results are of paramount importance for the future exploitation of the reservoir and provide a basis for the geological and thermodynamic modelling of active superhot geothermal systems in general.

1 Introduction

Los Humeros Volcanic Complex (LHVC; Figure 1), located in the eastern part of the Trans-Mexican volcanic belt (TMVB), hosts a conventional geothermal field (Ferrari et al., 2012; Gutiérrez-Negrín, 2019). On-going hydrothermal activity makes the LHVC a favorable area for geothermal exploitation and a geothermal power plant has been operating since the 1990s. The LHVC has been identified as an important natural laboratory for the development of general models of superhot geothermal systems (SHGSs) in volcanic calderas (e.g., Jolie et al., 2018).

While extensive geological field studies and well log analyses have provided many constraints on the near-surface geology of the caldera complex and conventional geothermal reservoir, conditions at depths greater than 2-3 km are largely unknown and currently being studied intensively (Jolie et al., 2018). It is assumed that superhot fluids could exist in the carbonate rock basement underlying the caldera (Jolie et al., 2018). These rocks might exhibit secondary permeability related to the damage zone of active resurgence faults and inherited pervasive basement structures (Lorenzo-Pulido, 2008; Rocha-López et al., 2010; Jolie et al., 2018; Norini et al., 2015, 2019). The maximum depth of these brittle structures is defined by the brittle/ductile (BD) transition zone, which thus plays an important role in geothermal exploration because upper crustal faults and fractures behave as hydraulic channels for the circulation of geothermal fluids (e.g., Ranalli & Rybach, 2005). In SHGSs that exhibit a positive thermal anomaly, the depth of the BD transition may differ from areas with a normal thermal gradient, as rocks become progressively more ductile with increasing temperature. Thus, a positive thermal anomaly could potentially limit the volume of rocks where secondary permeability may exist.

We use three-component (3C) beamforming to extract structural information from ambient seismic noise. 3C beamforming is an array technique, which, like standard beamforming, estimates the dominant propagation direction and wavenumber of a recorded wavefield, but in addition also determines the polarization of the wavefield by comparing phase shifts across different components (Riahi et al., 2013). As a result, different wave types can be distinguished and their propagation parameters analyzed separately. This allows us, for example, to estimate wavefield composition and surface wave anisotropy, which is, however, beyond the scope of this study. Here, we consider fundamental mode Rayleigh waves only and extract dispersion curves from frequency-wavenumber () histograms; these are inverted for a shear-velocity depth profile using a reversible-jump Markov-chain Monte Carlo (rj-McMC) algorithm. While this algorithm is computationally expensive, it has the advantage of providing uncertainties for the velocity profile by finding the distribution of models that are consistent with data.

3C beamforming does not require impulsive (man-made or natural) seismic sources and is thus cheap, flexible, and applicable also in aseismic areas. While cross-correlation based ambient noise methods typically rely on month long recordings, from beamforming we extract stable dispersion curves from only one day of seismic noise data. Depending on the array geometry and seismic noise spectrum, the depth sensitivity of 3C beamforming can exceed that of other seismic methods by several kilometers, as we will show in this study. The analysis of four reflection seismic lines recorded across the LHVC, for example, provided 2D velocity maps and seismic sections down to 6 km at most (Jousset et al., 2019a). Ambient noise cross-correlation methods applied in the same area, but using a larger array, produce 3D tomographic images down to a maximum of 10 km depth (Granados et al. 2020, Martins et al. 2020). In a similar manner, a recent local earthquake tomography study provides information only of the upper 3-4 km (Toledo et al. 2020). We show that 3C beamforming provides information to greater than 10 km depth.

In the following, we describe geology and available data sets, introduce both 3C beamforming and the rj-McMC inversion algorithm, and summarize our findings in Los Humeros and their implications for SHGSs in general.

1.1 Geology of Los Humeros volcanic complex (LHVC)

The LHVC basement is composed of Mesozoic sedimentary rocks involved in the Late Cretaceous–Eocene compressive orogenic phase that generated the Mexican fold and thrust belt (MFTB) (*Sedimentary basement* unit in Figure 1) (Fitz-Díaz et al., 2017, and references therein). The sedimentary basement rests above the Precambrian-Paleozoic crystalline basement of the *Teziutlan Massif* unit, made of greenschists, granodiorites and granites (e.g. Suter, 1987; Suter et al., 1997; Ortuño-Arzate et al., 2003; Angeles-Moreno, 2012; Fitz-Díaz et al., 2017) (Figure 1a, b). Since the Eocene, the area underwent a limited extensional tectonic phase, associated with NE-striking normal faults and the emplacement of Eocene–Miocene granite and granodiorite magmatic intrusions (Figure 1a). The TMVB volcanic activity occurred from 10.5 Ma to 1.55 Ma with the emplacement of fractured andesites, basaltic lava flows and few volcanoclastic levels (*Old volcanic succession* unit in Figure 1) (e.g., Yanez & Garcia, 1982; Ferriz & Mahood, 1984; López-Hernández, 1995; Cedillo-Rodríguez, 1997; Carrasco-Núñez et al., 2017b, 2018). Volcanic activity resumed ~700 ka ago with the emplacement of the Pleistocene-Holocene LHVC (*LHVC* unit in Figure 1) (e.g., Carrasco-Núñez et al., 2017b, 2018). This volcanic complex represents a basaltic andesite-rhyolite system of two nested calderas, namely the outer Los Humeros caldera and the inner Los Potreros caldera (Carrasco-Núñez et al., 2017b; Calcagno et al., 2018) (Figure 1a). The LHVC caldera stage occurred between ~165 ka and ~69 ka and consisted of two major caldera-forming events, that emplaced more than 100 km³ of ignimbrite deposits (Yanez & Garcia, 1982; Ferriz & Mahood, 1984; Carrasco-Núñez et al., 2017b, 2018). Widespread post-caldera monogenetic volcanic activity and resurgence of Los Potreros caldera floor occurred since 50 ka (Norini et al., 2015, 2019) (Figure 1a).

The conventional geothermal field under exploitation is located in Los Potreros caldera, in the area deformed by resurgence faults (Figure 1a), and is hosted by the Miocene-Pleistocene andesites, sealed by the LHVC ignimbrite deposits and/or the upper part of the pre-LHVC volcanic units (e.g., Cedillo-Rodríguez, 1997; Arellano et al., 2003; Carrasco-Núñez et al., 2017a; Norini et al., 2015, 2019). The permeability in the conventional reservoir is mainly secondary, generated by volcanotectonic faults and inherited tectonic structures (e.g. Cedillo-Rodríguez, 1997; Arellano et al., 2003; Norini et al., 2015, 2019) (Figure 1). At the surface, hydrothermal alteration of recent volcanic rocks is exposed along most of the volcanotectonic fault scarps, where sharp thermal anomalies have been identified by remote sensing (Norini et al., 2015, 2019). The maximum temperature of the hydrothermal fluids is around 400°C, measured at approximately 2.5 km depth (Arellano et al., 2003; Lorenzo-Pulido, 2008; Rocha-López et al., 2010).

2 Data and Methods

2.1 Seismic array and data processing

A multipurpose, temporary seismic array was installed across the LHVC, which recorded continuously from September 2017 to September 2018 (see Data and Resources section and Toledo et al., 2019). It consisted of 45 three-component stations, 25 broadband and 20 short-period, centered around previously located microseismic events within the inner caldera. For ambient noise beamforming, we use up to 17 stations of the dense broadband (DB) array (triangles in Figure 1a) with a frequency sensitivity down to below 0.01 Hz and a sampling rate of 200 Hz. The analysis was restricted to ten days in October and November 2017, when

at least 14 stations were operating and dispersion curves had good quality. The corresponding array response function gives the beam response for a wave coming from directly below the array (with wavenumber k_z) and is shown in Figure 2.

Data processing is carried out following Riahi et al. (2013) and Löer et al. (2018). Data are down-sampled to 10 Hz, band-pass filtered between 0.01 Hz and 1 Hz, and cleared from linear trends. We apply spectral whitening and one-bit normalization in the time domain in order to suppress large amplitude signals from earthquakes and to equalize amplitudes across different stations. While time-domain normalization removes absolute amplitude information, we found that it significantly improved the extraction of Rayleigh wave dispersion curves compared to other methods tested. Time series are divided into short windows, which are then beamformed separately. The length of a single time window corresponds to four times the minimum period, rounded up to the next power of two to speed up Fourier transformation. To this end, data are processed in three frequency bins, 0.08 to 0.155 Hz, 0.160 to 0.310 Hz, and 0.315 to 0.430 Hz, with corresponding time window lengths of 51.2 s, 25.6 s and 12.8 s, respectively. This way, the *relative* time window length with respect to frequency is kept constant and, compared to a constant *absolute* time window length, the number of superimposed waves, especially for larger frequencies, is reduced. Afterwards, an average beam response of ten consecutive time windows is computed.

2.2 Three-component beamforming

In standard, vertical-component beamforming, the horizontal wavenumber k_x and the azimuth ϕ of a wavefield recorded at an array are estimated by analyzing phase shifts of the signal recorded at different stations within a small time and frequency window (Rost & Thomas, 2002). When three-component data is available, one can also analyze the phase shift between different components of each station and thereby estimate the orientation of particle motion of the dominant wave, hence its polarization (e.g., Riahi et al., 2013; Löer et al., 2018). In this case, the beam response is computed as a function of three parameters, namely the horizontal wavenumber k_x and the azimuth ϕ , combined in the horizontal wavenumber vector

$$\mathbf{k}_h = \begin{pmatrix} k_x \\ \phi \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

and the so-called polarization state \mathbf{p} , according to

$$\mathbf{p} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

Note that all operations are performed in the frequency domain for a single frequency f ; the frequency dependence is dropped in all equations for brevity. In Equation 2, \mathbf{C} represents the cross-spectral density matrix of three-component array data in the frequency domain, and

$$\mathbf{C} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbf{d}_n \mathbf{d}_n^H \quad (3)$$

is the Kronecker product of phase shifts \mathbf{p}_i and \mathbf{k}_i , caused by polarization and wavenumber vector, respectively. Quantity

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi_i \\ \sin \phi_i \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

is an N -dimensional vector (Riahi et al., 2013), where \mathbf{r}_i denote the i different station locations of the array. It is related to the array response vector

$$\mathbf{r} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{r}_1 \\ \mathbf{r}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{r}_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

known from standard beamforming. \mathbf{p} is a complex vector representing the polarization ellipse parameterized by θ . The four polarisation parameters denote

azimuth (θ), dip (δ), ellipticity (ϵ), and tilt (τ) of a cylindrical coordinate system. For details, see Riahi et al. (2013) and L  er et al. (2018). The maximum of the beam response gives the parameter combination (θ , δ , and ϵ) that matches the parameters of the actual wavefield best.

The resolvable wavenumber range is restricted by the geometry of the array (the minimum and maximum inter-station distances r_{\min} and r_{\max} , and the location of stations with respect to one another). A first estimate is obtained using an approximation for the resolvable wavelength λ ,

$$\lambda \approx \frac{2\pi r_{\max}}{k_{\max} - k_{\min}} \quad (6)$$

(Tokimatsu, 1997), and transferring it to wavenumber:

$$k_{\min} = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \quad k_{\max} = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \quad (7)$$

For Los Humeros DB array with $N = 10$ and $M = 10$ this results in $k_{\min} = 0.001$ and $k_{\max} = 0.002$. We note, however, that the wavenumber sensitivity is slightly azimuthally dependent due to the irregular aperture of the array as can be seen in the array response function (Figure 2). Note that ambient noise tomography (ANT) based on cross-correlations requires inter-station distances larger than one typical wavelength, i.e., $r_{\min} > \lambda$ (e.g. Luo et al., 2015). That means, using the same seismic array, larger wavelengths and hence deeper structures can be investigated using ambient noise beamforming compared to ANT.

From horizontal wavenumber k , surface wave phase velocity v can be computed from $v = \omega/k$. Otherwise, by estimating minimum and maximum local phase velocities v_{\min} and v_{\max} , wavenumber limits can be transferred to frequency limits according to

$$f_{\min} = \frac{v_{\min}}{\lambda} \quad f_{\max} = \frac{v_{\max}}{\lambda} \quad (8)$$

Taking $f_{\min} = 0.001$ and $f_{\max} = 0.002$ and using the wavenumber limits from Equation 7, we obtain a resolvable frequency range of $f \in [0.001, 0.002]$ for surface waves.

In our analysis, we use discrete frequency steps of $\Delta f = 0.001$. The wavenumber is limited to $k \in [0.001, 0.002]$ and sampled at discrete intervals of $\Delta k = 0.001$ in agreement with the resolution constraints of the array. The azimuth is sampled counter-clockwise from East in $\Delta \theta = 10^\circ$ -steps. The incidence angle varies between $\theta = 0^\circ$ (vertical) and $\theta = 90^\circ$ (horizontal) in $\Delta \theta = 10^\circ$ -steps for body waves and is constant ($\theta = 0^\circ$) for surface waves.

2.3 Dispersion curve retrieval and inversion

In a medium where velocities change with depth, surface waves are dispersive, i.e., different frequencies propagate at different velocities since they oscillate at different depths. Using ambient noise beamforming, we measure frequency dependent Rayleigh wave phase velocities, which are displayed as dispersion curves representing velocity as a function of frequency. Dispersion curves are extracted from two-dimensional histograms, showing how often a specific wavenumber was measured at a specific frequency for a given time window and polarization. Histograms of consecutive time windows are stacked up to one day. Figure 3a shows one such histogram for Rayleigh wave polarization on day 300 in 2017. From the daily wavenumber histograms, we extract the maximum of the distribution at each frequency, which yields a curve $v(f)$. Using $v(f)$, we then transfer it from the wavenumber to the phase velocity domain. Taking the average of multiple daily curves, we compute a mean curve and its standard deviation (Figure 3b), down sampled to $\Delta f = 0.001$ for a faster application of the inversion scheme.

The average dispersion curve is inverted using a Bayesian inversion scheme. Bayesian inversions are performed using the method of reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo (rj-McMC) (Green, 1995; Bodin et al., 2012). These methods update a *prior* probability distribution that describes information about model parameters that is independent of the current data, with the new information added by that data. This process is known as Bayesian inference, and the result is a *posterior* distribution over parameters. The rj-McMC algorithm performs the update while allowing the number and depth-extent of seismic velocity parameters of horizontally layered media (and hence the dimensionality of parameter space) to vary in the inversion. The parameterization is adapted to only the complexity required by the combination of prior information and data, which improves results on otherwise high-dimensional nonlinear inverse problems. The resulting probability density function (PDF) provides the distribution of models that are consistent with the data.

Prior information about seismic shear velocities is assigned to be a uniform distribution between 0.5 km/s and 4.5 km/s , and the number of layers in depth is allowed to vary between 5 and 25, with the maximum depth constrained to 25 km . Each run of rj-McMC then generates a chain of 2 million samples (example velocity models), which are distributed according to the posterior distribution as the number tends to infinity. The rj-McMC inversion scheme is run multiple times (here, 12 chains in total), each starting from a different random model. To obtain approximately independent samples, we retain only every 250th sample after the first 0.5 million samples (the *burn-in* period) in each chain for analysis. The density of the final set of retained samples represents the PDF of shear velocity with depth.

3 Results

Figure 4a shows the PDF of shear velocity as a function of depth, where the zero level equals 2.9 km above sea level, that is, the average topographic height of the seismic stations considered. Dimensions are 500 x 100 grid-points, with a grid spacing of 1 km in z-direction and about 1 km in x-direction. For each grid-point, the number of samples indicates the number of models that assign a certain shear velocity to the respective depth. The color scale has been normalized with respect to the maximum number of samples at each depth level. Light colors indicate velocities of higher probability compared to dark colors. The solid white curve denotes the maximum likelihood of the PDF, the dashed curve is the mean of the PDF and the dotted white curve shows the shear velocity profile obtained from earthquake analysis for comparison (T. Toledo 2019, personal communication, 1 June 2020). The latter was estimated using the code *Veltest* (Kissling et al., 1994) for joint inversion for P- and S-wave models using travel time data from 333 local seismic events.

In Figure 4b, we display a shear velocity profile that combines the results from both methods: down to 3.2 km it is based on earthquake data (dotted curve in Figure 4a), below 3.2 km it follows ambient noise beamforming results (solid curve in Figure 4a). The earthquake-based profile is reliable mostly in the upper few kilometers, because seismicity was restricted down to a maximum of 6 km below the surface with over 80 % of all events occurring above 3.2 km (see Figure S1 in electronic supplement for depth distribution). Below this depth it reflects the initial input model. For the noise-based profile, given the frequency limits discussed in chapter 4, surface waves are expected to be most sensitive to depths between 2 and 12 km (see Figure S1 in electronic supplement for sensitivity kernels). For depths between 2 and 4 km both profiles are in good agreement. Laterally, they provide average velocities for the area covered by the DB-array.

Background colors in Figure 4b indicate different geological sections. For the LHVC and the old volcanic succession, section transitions correspond to average transition depths observed in well logs at 0.9 and 2.2 km, respectively (Norini et al., 2019). Deeper section

transitions could not be observed in well logs and are thus derived from discontinuities in the shear-velocity profile.

At 5.1 km depth, shear velocities increase abruptly from around 2.6 to 3.3 km s⁻¹, implying the transition from the sedimentary to the crystalline basement (the Teziutlan massif), which so far has only been mapped at the surface west-northwest of the central caldera (Figure 1a). Laboratory values for S-wave velocities at respective pressure conditions confirm a range between 2.5 and 3.1 km s⁻¹ for limestones and between 3.2 and 3.6 km s⁻¹ for granites and granodiorites (Gebrande, 1982). Bär & Weydt (2019) performed ultrasonic pulse velocity measurements at rock samples from Los Humeros geothermal wells, reporting S-wave velocities between 2.2 and 3.6 km s⁻¹ at an average of 3.4 km s⁻¹ for limestones at surface temperature. With increasing temperature, they show that S-wave velocities decrease to about 1.5 km s⁻¹ at 400°C. A comprehensive petrophysical database for Los Humeros rock types can be found in Weydt et al. (2020).

At about 7 km depth, the velocity profile shows another sudden increase of shear velocity, which could indicate a geological boundary within the generally heterogeneous Teziutlan massive (Yanez & Garcia, 1982; Angeles-Moreno, 2012) or an intrusive body never identified before. We note, however, that the PDF exhibits a relatively broad velocity distribution (Figure 4a) at and below that depth and that also the mean curve implies a considerable uncertainty with respect to depth and magnitude of the discontinuity. Thus, a more gradual velocity change related to increasing pressure conditions seems equally likely.

The decline in shear velocity observed at about 10.5 km depth is interpreted as the onset of the BD transition, which correlates with a decrease in shear strength (e.g., Imber et al., 2008). This transition marks the maximum depth for the occurrence of brittle structures that could facilitate secondary permeability.

4 Discussion & Conclusions

Analyzing ambient seismic noise data, we have imaged for the first time the bottom depth of the sedimentary basement and the BD transition zone in the area of Los Humeros geothermal field. We used three-component beamforming to retrieve Rayleigh wave dispersion curves from noise data, which were then inverted to give a shear-velocity profile using a rj-McMC algorithm. The profile complements results from earthquake-based methods, which are in good agreement with geological data obtained from well logs, however, these methods provide information only down to a maximum of ~4 km. The depth sensitivity of our method extends down to 15 km, covering the transition from the sedimentary to the crystalline basement in 5 km depth and the BD transition zone around 10 km depth.

Generally, rocks become progressively more ductile with depth because of the increasing temperature, until the BD transition is reached (Ranalli & Rybach, 2005). Our results demonstrate for the first time in the LHVC area that even if the geothermal gradient is higher than for normal crust (e.g., Arellano et al., 2003; Lorenzo-Pulido, 2008; Rocha-López et al., 2010), and if alteration of the rocks hosting the hydrothermal fluids occur with an expected reduction of the total rock strength (e.g., Arzate et al., 2018; Norini et al., 2019), both sedimentary succession (*Sedimentary basement* unit in Figures 1 and 4) and upper part of the underlying crystalline basement (*Teziutlan massif* unit in Figures 1 and 4) exhibit a brittle rheology down to 10 km below the topographic surface. The 10 km deep BD transition acts as the root zone of brittle structures responsible for secondary permeability in the geothermal reservoir and potentially hosting superhot fluids. The rheological zonation identified at 10 km below surface should thus be included in any geological model of the caldera complex and hydrothermal system, as well as in heat flow and heat transfer modelling (e.g., Calcagno et al., 2019).

One way to verify our results would be to test them against receiver functions, which are generally used to investigate the near-surface structure using body wave energy from distant sources that have been refracted and converted at layers beneath a seismometer (Phinney, 1964; Vinnik, 1977). Galetti et al. (2012) showed that the theories of receiver functions and seismic interferometry are closely connected and that the former could also be computed from ambient noise sources and across different stations. To show this, however, is beyond the scope of this work and will be subject to future research.

We provide an estimate of the BD transition depth at 10 km that is independent from local seismicity, since our shear-velocity profile has been estimated from ambient noise. Our results confirm that declining seismicity below 3.2 km depth is not caused by the transition from brittle to ductile rheology; instead, it is related to the maximum exploitation depth of the geothermal field. Seismicity studies at LHVC prior to exploitation activities have been minimum (Ponce and Rodriguez, 1977), with most studies being accomplished during the exploitation phase (e.g. Lermo et al. 2008). These studies along with a more recent survey (Gaucher, 2019; Jousset et al. 2019b, Toledo et al., 2020) show minimum local seismicity mostly related to the geothermal field activities. In fact, earthquakes at LHVC occur mostly in clusters located close to injection wells. Some of these events have depths larger than the injection wells (~2.5 km depth), and are located in the limestones belonging to the *Sedimentary Basement* unit, suggesting possible local fracturing of this layer due to pressure changes caused by injection and production activities. The heterogeneous focal mechanisms (mostly strike-slip with left and right-lateral motion) (Lermo et al., 2008) and the temporal relation of the seismicity rate with injection rates (Lermo et al., 2008; Jousset et al., 2019b) seem to confirm that parts of the local seismicity is induced by local stresses due to injection. Another part of the seismicity is of tectonic origin.

The presented shear-velocity model may also help to constrain boundary conditions for other methods. For example, it can be used as a starting model for 3D seismic tomography (Gaucher et al., 2019, Toledo et al., 2020), in earthquake localization with time-reverse imaging (Werner & Saenger, 2018) or for assessing the correlation between rock moduli and temperature (Mendrinós et al., 2019).

Overall, we demonstrate that three-component beamforming of ambient noise combined with dispersion curve inversion using the rj-McMC algorithm provides information on deeper structures of SHGSs that is typically not found by standard methods such as well log or seismicity analysis. Based on ambient seismic noise, the method is also applicable in aseismic regions where other methods are altogether infeasible. It complements ambient noise cross-correlation based techniques, which, while providing 3D tomographic images, require a significantly larger array aperture to reach the same depth sensitivity and are computationally much more expensive. 3C beamforming provides a quick first estimate of deep geological structures from a 1D seismic profile, which can also serve as initial model for other methods. Our findings in the LHVC suggest that SHGSs can exhibit brittle rheology at large depths despite positive thermal anomalies, increasing the rock volume available for geothermal exploitation.

Data and Resources

Waveform data and associated metadata are available from the GEOFON data center under network code 6G (<https://geofon.gfz-potsdam.de/doi/network/6G/2017>) and are embargoed until January 2023.

The Comisión Federal de Electricidad (CFE) of Mexico kindly provided logs of geothermal wells and access to the geothermal concession area.

Cartographic data are stored in a personal geodatabase and the final map of Figure 1 was produced in ESRI ArcMap 10.3.

In the electronic supplement we provide a figure showing the depth sensitivity kernels of Rayleigh waves compared to the depth distribution of local seismicity (Figure S1) as well as a table listing geothermal wells and transition depths of geological units identified in the corresponding well logs (Table S1).

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the GEMex Project, funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 727550, and by the Mexican Energy Sustainability Fund CONACYT-SENER, WP 4.5 of the project 2015-04-268074. Katrin Löer has received funding from the German Research Foundation (DFG) under project no. 298820846. We acknowledge Gerardo Carrasco-Núñez for useful discussions on the geology of LHVC and the CFE personnel for their support during the study of the geothermal field. We also thank Benedikt Ahrens for valuable contributions to the interpretation of the velocity profile.

References

- Angeles-Moreno, E. (2012). Geological Map of the Western Border of the Cuicateco Terrane, Southern Mexico. *Geological Society of America*, MCH102 (1 sheet).
- Arellano, V.M., Garcia, A., Barragan, R.M., Izquierdo, G., Aragon, A., & Nieva, D. (2003). An updated conceptual model of the Los Humeros geothermal reservoir (Mexico). *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 124, 67–88.
- Arzate, J., Corbo, F., Carrasco-Núñez, G., Hernández, J., & Yutsis, V. (2018). The Los Humeros (Mexico) geothermal field model deduced from new geophysical and geological data. *Geothermics*, 71, 200–211.
- Bär, K., & Weydt, L. (2019). Comprehensive report on the rock and fluid samples and their physical properties in the Acoculco and Los Humeros Basins. Deliverable D6.1, WP6, GEMex H2020 project, European Commission, <http://www.h2020gemex.eu>, 2019.
- Bodin, T., Sambridge, M., Vm c rH., Arroucau, P., Gallagher, K., & Rawlinson, N. (2012). Transdimensional inversion of receiver functions and surface wave dispersion. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 117(B2), doi: 10.1029/2011JB008560.
- Calcagno, P., Evanno, G., Trumpy, E., Gutiérrez-Negrín, L. C., Macías, J. L., Carrasco-Núñez, G., & Liotta, D. (2018). Preliminary 3-D geological models of Los Humeros and Acoculco geothermal fields (Mexico) óH2020 GEMex Project. *Advances in Geosciences*, 45, 321-333.
- Calcagno P., Trumpy, E., Gutiérrez-Negrín, L. C., Norini, G., Macías, J. L., Carrasco-Núñez, G., et al. (2019). Updating the 3D Geomodels of Los Humeros and Acoculco Geothermal Systems (Mexico) óH2020 GEMex Project. Paper presented at World Geothermal Congress 2020, Reykjavik, Iceland.
- Carrasco-Núñez, G., Lopez-Martinez, M., Hernandez, J., & Vargas, V. (2017a). Subsurface stratigraphy and its correlation with the surficial geology at Los Humeros geothermal field, eastern Trans-Mexican Volcanic Belt. *Geothermics*, 67, 1–7.
- Carrasco-Núñez, G., Hernandez, J., De Leon, L., Davila, P., Norini, G., Bernal, J. P., & Lopez, P. (2017b). Geologic map of Los Humeros volcanic complex and geothermal field, eastern Trans-Mexican Volcanic Belt. *Terra Digitalis*, 1 (2), 1–11.

- 1 Carrasco-Núñez, G., Bernal, J.P., Davila, P., Jicha, B., Giordano, G., & Hernandez, J. (2018).
2 Reappraisal of Los Humeros volcanic complex by new U/Th zircon and $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dating:
3 Implications for greater geothermal potential. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*, 19,
4 132–149.
- 5 Cedillo-Rodríguez, F. (1997). Geología del subsuelo del campo geotermico de Los Humeros,
6 Puebla. *Internal Report HU/RE/03/97*, Comisión Federal de Electricidad, Gerencia de
7 Proyectos Geotermoelectricos, Residencia Los Humeros, Puebla.
- 8 Ferrari, L., Orozco-Esquivel, T., Manea, V., & Manea, M., (2012). The dynamic history of
9 the Trans Mexican Volcanic Belt and the Mexico subduction zone. *Tectonophysics*, 522, 122-
10 149.
- 11 Ferriz, H., & Mahood, G. (1984). Eruptive rates and compositional trends at Los Humeros
12 volcanic center, Puebla, Mexico. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 89, 8511-8524.
- 13 Fitz-Díaz, E., Lawton, T.F., Juárez-Arriaga, E., & Chávez-Cabello, G. (2017). The
14 Cretaceous- Paleogene Mexican orogen: structure, basin development, magmatism and
15 tectonics. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 183, 56-84.
- 16 Galetti, E., & Curtis, A. (2012). Generalised receiver functions and seismic interferometry.
17 *Tectonophysics*, 532, 1-26.
- 18 Gaucher, E., Toledo, T., Metz, M., Figueroa-Soto, A. G., & Calò, M. (2019). One year of
19 passive seismic monitoring of the Los Humeros (Mexico) geothermal field. Presented at the
20 European Geothermal Congress 2019, Den Haag, The Netherlands.
- 21 Gebrande, H. (1982). *Elastic wave velocities and constants of elasticity of rocks and rock-*
22 *forming minerals* (subvolume B: Landolt-Börnstein - Group V Geophysics).
23 Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.
- 24 Granados Chavarria, I., Calò, M., Figueroa Soto, Á., & Jousset, P. (2020). 3D Anisotropic
25 velocity model of the Los Humeros geothermal field, Mexico, using seismic ambient noise
26 tomography. Paper presented at EGU General Assembly 2020, Online, 4 & May 2020,
27 <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu2020-12544>.
- 28 Green, P. J. (1995). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian
29 model determination. *Biometrika*, 82(4), 711–732.
- 30 Gutiérrez-Negrín, L. C. A. (2019). Current status of geothermal-electric production in
31 Mexico. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 249(1), 012017.
- 32 Imber, J., Holdsworth, R. E., Smith, S. A. F., Jefferies, S. P., & Collettini, C. (2008).
33 Frictional-viscous flow, seismicity and the geology of weak faults: a review and future
34 directions. *Geological Society, London, Special Publications*, 299(1), 151-173.
- 35 Jolie, E., Bruhn, D., Hernández, A. L., Liotta, D., Garduño-Monroy, V. H., Lelli, M., et al.
36 (2018). GEMex – A Mexican-European Research Cooperation on Development of Superhot
37 and Engineered Geothermal Systems. Paper presented at 43rd Workshop on Geothermal
38 Reservoir Engineering Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- 39 Jousset, P., Ágústsson, K., Barison, E., Bám, G., Calò, M., Chavarria, I. G., et al. (2019a).
40 Seismic structures of the Acoculco and Los Humeros geothermal fields. Deliverable D5.3,
41 WP5, GEMex H2020 project, European Commission, <http://www-h2020.eu>, 2019
- 42 Jousset, P., Toledo, T., Finger, C., Löer, K., & Saenger, E. H. (2019b). Time dependent
43 processes within the Mexican fields. Deliverable D5.4, WP5, GEMex H2020 project,
44 European Commission, <http://www-h2020.eu>, 2019

- 1 Kissling, E., Ellsworth, W.L., Eberhart-Phillips, D., & Kradolfer, U. (1994). Initial reference
2 models in local earthquake tomography. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 99(B10), 19635 ó
3 19646.
- 4 Lermo, J., Y. Antayhua, L. Quintanar, and C. Lorenzo (2008), Estudio sismológico del campo
5 geotérmico de Los Humeros, Puebla, México. Parte I: Sismicidad, mecanismos de fuente y
6 distribución de esfuerzos, *Geotermia, Revista Mexicana de Geoenergía*, 21(1), 25 ó41.
- 7 López-Hernández, A. (1995). Estudio Regional Volcanico y Estructural del Campo
8 Geotermico de Los Humeros, Pue., Mexico. *Geotermia: revista mexicana de geoenergía*,
9 11(1), 17 ó6.
- 10 Luo, Y., Yang, Y., Xu, Y., Xu, H., Zhao, K., & Wang, K. (2015). On the limitations of
11 interstation distances in ambient noise tomography. *Geophysical Journal International*,
12 201(2), 652-661.
- 13 Löer, K., Riahi, N., & Saenger, E. H. (2018). Three-component ambient noise beamforming
14 in the Parkfield area. *Geophysical Journal International*, 213(3), 1478-1491.
- 15 Lorenzo-Pulido, C. D. (2008). Borehole geophysics and geology of well H-43, Los Humeros
16 geothermal field, Puebla, México. Geothermal Training Program Report, 9, 23, Orkustofnun,
17 Grensásvegur, Reykjavík, Iceland.
- 18 Martins, J., Obermann, A., Verdel, A., & Jousset, P. (2020). 3D-S wave velocity model of the
19 Los Humeros geothermal field, Mexico, by ambient-noise tomography. Paper presented at
20 EGU General Assembly 2020, Online, 4 ó8 May 2020, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu2020-21956>.
- 22 Mendrinos, D., Karytsas, S., Karytsas, C., Poletto, F., & Farina, B. (2019). Report on
23 distribution of rock modulus and correlation with temperature. Deliverable D5.11, WP5,
24 GEMex H2020 project, European Commission, <http://www.h2020.eu>, 2019
- 25 Norini, G., GropPELLI, G., Sulpizio, R., Carrasco-Núñez, G., Dávila-Harris, P., Pellicioli, et al.
26 (2015). Structural analysis and thermal remote sensing of the Los Humeros Volcanic
27 Complex: implications for volcano structure and geothermal exploration. *Journal of*
28 *Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 301, 221-237.
- 29 Norini, G., Carrasco Núñez, G., Corbo-Camargo, F., Lermo, J., Hernández Rojas, J., Castro,
30 C., et al. (2019). The structural architecture of the Los Humeros volcanic complex and
31 geothermal field. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, 381, 312-329.
- 32 Ortuño-Arzate, S., Ferket, H., Cacas, M. C., Swennen, R., & Roure, F. (2003). Late
33 cretaceous carbonate reservoirs in the Cordoba platform and Veracruz Basin, Eastern Mexico.
34 In: *The Circum-Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean: Hydrocarbon Habitats, Basin Formation,*
35 *and Plate Tectonics*, Bartolini, C., Buffler, R. T., & Blickwede, J. F. (eds.), American
36 Association of Petroleum Geologists Memoir, vol. 79, Ch. 22, 476-514.
- 37 Phinney, R.A. (1964). Structure of the Earth's Crust from Spectral Behavior of Long- Period
38 Body Waves. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 69 (14), 2997 ó017.
- 39 Ponce, L. y C. Rodríguez, 1977. Microearthquake activity associated to Los Humeros caldera,
40 Mexico: Preliminary survey. *Geofísica Internacional*, Vol. 17-4, pp. 461-478.
- 41 Ranalli, G., & Rybach, L. (2005). Heat flow, heat transfer and lithosphere rheology in
42 geothermal areas: Features and examples. *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*,
43 148, 3-19.

1 Riahi, N., Bokelmann, G., Sala, P., & Saenger, E. H. (2013). V k o g n c r u g " c p c n { u k u
2 u w t h c e g " y c x g " c p k u q v t q r { < " C " v j t g g e q p g p v " c
3 Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth, 118(10), 5339-5351.

4 Rocha-López, S., Ramírez-Silva, G., Jiménez-Salgado, E., & Lorenzo-Pulido, C. (2010).
5 Results of geological & geophysics drilling of the well H 43 the geothermal field in Humeros,
6 Puebla, Mexico. Paper presented at World Geothermal Congress 2010, Bali, Indonesia.

7 Rost, S., & Thomas, C. (2002). Array seismology: Methods and applications. *Reviews of*
8 *Geophysics*, 40(3), 2-1-2-27.

9 Suter, M. (1987). Structural traverse across the Sierra Madre Oriental fold-thrust belt in east-
10 central Mexico, Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, 98, 249-264.

11 Suter, M., Contreras-Pérez, J., & Ochoa Camarillo, H. (1997). Structure of the Sierra Madre
12 Oriental fold-thrust belt in east-central Mexico. In: II Convención sobre la Evolución
13 Geológica de México, Libro-guía de las excursiones geológicas, Excursión 2, 45-63.

14 Toledo, T., Gaucher, E., Metz, M., Calò, M., Figueroa, A., Angulo, J., Jousset, P., Kieling, K.,
15 & Saenger, E. H. (2019). Dataset of the 6G seismic network at Los Humeros, 2017-2018.
16 GFZ Data Services, Other/Seismic Network, doi:10.14470/1T7562235078.

17 Toledo T., Gaucher E., Jousset P., Jentsch, A., Haberland, C., Maurer H., et al. (2020). Local
18 earthquake tomography at Los Humeros geothermal field (Mexico). *Journal of Geophysical*
19 *Research: Solid Earth*, submitted.

20 Vinnik, L.P. (1977). Detection of waves converted from P to SV in the mantle. *Physics of*
21 *The Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 15 (1), 39 & 45.

22 Werner, C., & Saenger, E. H. (2018). Obtaining reliable source locations with time reverse
23 imaging: limits to array design, velocity models and signal-to-noise ratios. *Solid Earth*, 9(6),
24 1487-1505.

25 Weydt, L. M., Ramírez-Guzmán, A. A., Pola, A., Lepillier, B., Kummerow, J., Mandrone, G.,
26 et al. (2020) Petrophysical and mechanical rock property database of the Los Humeros and
27 Acoculco geothermal fields (Mexico). *Earth System Science Data*, submitted.

28 Yanez, C., & Garcia, S. (1982). Exploracion de la region geotermica Los Humeros-Las
29 Derrumbadas. *Internal Report 29/82*, Estados de Puebla y Veracruz, Comisión Federal de
30 Electricidad, p. 98.

1 **Mailing addresses**

2 Katrin Löer

3 Bochum University of Applied Sciences
4 Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
5 Lennershofstr. 140
6 44801 Bochum
7 Germany
8 *As of 1 July 2020:*
9 Department of Geology and Geophysics
10 University of Aberdeen
11 Meston Building
12 King's College
13 Aberdeen AB24 3UE
14 UK

15 Tania Toledo

16 German Research Centre for Geosciences GFZ
17 Section 4.8 Geoenergy
18 Section 2.2 Geophysical Deep Sounding
19 Telegrafenberg
20 14473 Potsdam
21 Germany

22 Gianluca Norini

23 Istituto di Geologia Ambientale e Geoingegneria
24 Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
25 Area della Ricerca CNR - ARM3
26 Via Roberto Cozzi 53
27 20125 Milano
28 Italy

29 Xin Zhang

30 University of Edinburgh
31 School of Geosciences
32 Grant Institute
33 V j g " M k plingø u " D w k
34 James Hutton Road
35 Edinburgh EH9 3FE
36 UK

37 Andrew Curtis

38 University of Edinburgh
39 School of Geosciences
40 Grant Institute
41 V j g " M k plingø u " D w k
42 James Hutton Road
43 Edinburgh EH9 3FE
44 UK
45 Institut für Geophysik
46 ETH Zürich, NO H 51.3

1 Sonneggstrasse 5
2 8092 Zürich
3 Switzerland
4 Erik H. Saenger
5 Bochum University of Applied Sciences
6 Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
7 Lennershofstr. 140
8 44801 Bochum
9 Germany
10 Institut für Geologie, Mineralogie und Geophysik
11 Ruhr-Universität Bochum
12 Lennershofstr. 150
13 44801 Bochum
14 Germany
15 Fraunhofer-Einrichtung für Energieinfrastrukturen und Geothermie IEG
16 44801 Bochum
17 Germany

Figure captions

Figure 1. (a) Simplified geological map of the Los Humeros Volcanic Complex (LHVC) and surrounding basement, on a shaded relief. The trace of the A-A' geological cross-section of Figure 1b is shown. Triangles denote seismic station locations of the dense broadband network, circles denote geothermal wells. In the upper-right inset, the location of the LHVC within the Trans-Mexican Volcanic Belt (TMVB) is indicated. **(b)** A-A' schematic geological cross section showing the subsurface geometry of the main structures and stratigraphic units. RF: resurgence fault (red lines); LP: Los Potreros caldera ring fault; LH: Los Humeros caldera ring fault; LHh: inferred flexure plane of the Los Humeros trap-door caldera; TF: thrust fault. Trace of the geological cross-section is shown in Figure 1a. Modified from Norini et al. (2019).

Figure 2. Array response function of the dense broadband seismic array shown in Figure 1a in the wavenumber domain.

Figure 3. (a) Two-dimensional histogram showing wavenumber versus frequency of retrograde Rayleigh wave detections on day 300 (2017), normalized per frequency. Black crosses mark wavenumber bins with maximum number of detections per frequency, . **(b)** Average dispersion curve (black) providing phase velocity as a function of frequency, , computed from 10 daily dispersion curves (gray) and down sampled to . Black error bars indicate twice the average standard deviation.

Figure 4. (a) Probability density function (PDF) of shear-velocity distribution as retrieved from rj-McMC inversion, normalized per depth level. The solid curve indicates maximum likelihood of the PDF, the dashed line is the mean and the dotted curve represents the profile retrieved from the analysis of earthquake data. **(b)** Combined shear-velocity profile (black) from the analysis of earthquake data (dotted curve in (a), down to 3.2 km depth) and ambient noise beamforming (solid curve in (a), below 3.2 km); background colors indicate geological structure (see legend) as in Figure 1b. Transition depths are derived from well data for the two upper sections (see Table S1 in electronic supplement) and from the shear-velocity PDF for the deeper structures. Dashed and dotted horizontal lines indicate the range of transition depths found in well data.

1 **Figures**

2

Figure 1. (a) Simplified geological map of the Los Humeros Volcanic Complex (LHVC) and surrounding basement, on a shaded relief. The trace of the A-A' geological cross-section of Figure 1b is shown. Triangles denote seismic station locations of the dense broadband network, circles denote geothermal wells. In the upper-right inset, the location of the LHVC within the Trans-Mexican Volcanic Belt (TMVB) is indicated. (b) A-A' schematic geological cross section showing the subsurface geometry of the main structures and stratigraphic units. RF: resurgence fault (red lines); LP: Los Potreros caldera ring fault; LH: Los Humeros caldera ring fault; LHh: inferred flexure plane of the Los Humeros trap-door caldera; TF: thrust fault. Trace of the geological cross-section is shown in Figure 1a. Modified from Norini et al. (2019).